

6-1999

N.B. Forrest: The Controversial Aspect of his Career (From a paper delivered before the Ohio Valley History Conference at Western Kentucky State University, Bowling Green)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/jphs>

 Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(1999) "N.B. Forrest: The Controversial Aspect of his Career (From a paper delivered before the Ohio Valley History Conference at Western Kentucky State University, Bowling Green)," *Jackson Purchase Historical Society*. Vol. 26 : No. 1 , Article 6.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/jphs/vol26/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Murray State's Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Jackson Purchase Historical Society by an authorized editor of Murray State's Digital Commons. For more information, please contact msu.digitalcommons@murraystate.edu.

N.B. FORREST: CONTROVERSIAL ASPECTS OF HIS CAREER
(From a paper delivered before the Ohio Valley History
Conference at Western Kentucky State University, Bowling Green)

Dr. Lonnie E. Maness

Nathan Bedford Forrest generated controversy while he lived, and in the minds of many people he is still very much a controversial figure. The three most outstanding events of Forrest's life which his detractors use to condemn him were his activities as a slave trader, the so-called Fort Pillow massacre, and his service as Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan. Each of these events in the famous general's life will be discussed, and it is hoped, put into proper historical perspective with Forrest not faring so badly as his detractors would have us believe.

On a very small scale, Forrest bought and sold slaves while conducting his mercantile and livery stable business in Hernando, Mississippi. He eventually opened a stage line, connecting Hernando with Memphis, and started a brickyard. In 1851 Forrest moved his family to Memphis and soon entered the slave trade business on a very large scale and continued in this fashion throughout the 1850s. However, Forrest was also involved in various other business ventures. He purchased land, real estate, and operated two plantations in northwest Mississippi and made money from all of these ventures.¹

Brian Steel Wills and Jack Hurst published biographies on Forrest which make two points in particular about Forrest's slave trade activities. They both cite plenty of evidence to support the conclusion that Forrest was a humane and kind slave trader. They maintain that Forrest treated his slaves well because of "economic self-interest." This conclusion is true as

far as it goes. Forrest was a good, kind and humane slave trader also because he was a humanitarian. This can be seen in his slave pen operations. When he purchased slaves, Forrest tried to purchase entire slave families. When he sold slaves, he would not sell different members of a slave family to different slave owners. Furthermore, he would not sell a slave to a master that he knew was harsh and cruel.² Forrest's humanitarianism can also be seen as a thread running throughout his life. At age sixteen, when his father died, he took over and aided his family and continued to do so even after riches came his way. He cared for the slaves on his Mississippi plantations, and his slaves admired and respected him. Even the slaves in his slave pens wanted to be used on his plantations. During the Civil War forty-five of his slaves served him faithfully, driving supply wagons, serving as cooks, and as horse handlers. Sometimes they operated behind enemy lines. Only one deserted, and Forrest set the other forty-five free before the war ended.³ Then on his plantation, after the war was over, Forrest risked his life in order to save the life of a black woman who was about to be killed by her husband.⁴ Forrest's previous biographers have correctly supported his humanitarianism.⁵ Forrest, the slave trader, was decidedly different from most other slave traders. His economic self-interest and his humanitarianism made him so.

The so-called Fort Pillow massacre of April 12, 1864, in my opinion, did not occur. While on this raid behind enemy lines, from March to early May of 1864, Forrest made Jackson, Tennessee, his headquarters. He established recruiting stations, something he always did while on raids into West

Tennessee. He captured the Union garrison at Union City, Tennessee, made up of the 7th Tennessee United States volunteers, commanded by Colonel Isaac R. Hawkins from Huntington, Tennessee, and recruited from West Tennessee counties such as Henderson, Carroll and others, men that Forrest's 7th Tennessee Confederate Cavalry regiment knew because most of them came from those counties. The 7th Tennessee Confederate Regiment, commanded by Colonel W.L. Duckworth, captured the garrison at Union City--a garrison of "traitors and turncoats" the Confederates called them, and none of these men were massacred.⁶ Forrest on two different occasions would also capture Paducah, Kentucky.⁷ While he was on this raid, he would seriously threaten the Union garrison at Columbus, Kentucky⁸, would fight numerous skirmishes throughout West Tennessee and would, of course, capture the Union garrison at Fort Pillow, made up of former slaves and white troops, most from Tennessee. It was, as viewed by Forrest's men, another garrison, by and large, of traitors.⁹

The capture of Fort Pillow on April 12, 1864, was one of General Forrest's most brilliant accomplishments and one of his most controversial. From that time forward, he would be charged with the massacre of Union troops, especially of the black troops that were stationed at this location. Whether a massacre took place or not will never be conclusively answered.

Several accounts support the charge of massacre. The Select Committee On The Conduct of the War investigated the Fort Pillow affair and concluded that there was a massacre, that the Confederates shot most of the garrison after it surrendered.¹⁰ A 1958 article by Albert Castel also concluded there was a

massacre. He stated that the garrison consisted of black troops whom the Confederates considered as inferiors and not much above armed slaves. The rest of the garrison was made up of Tennessee Unionists, many of whom were deserters from the Confederate army. Forrest's troopers considered them traitors to Tennessee, the Confederacy, and the white race. They also knew these troops were guilty of many outrages against the persons and property of the pro-Confederate population of many areas of West Tennessee. What resulted, Castel maintains, was a massacre of both black and white troops "out of race hatred, personal and political animosity, and battle fury" after Fort Pillow "had ceased resisting or was incapable of resistance."¹¹ John Cimprich and Robert C. Mainfort, Jr., in their 1982 study, agree with Castel and the Congressional Committee.¹² Furthermore, Brian Steel Wills and Jack Hurst, in biographies published in 1992 and 1993, also agree with the massacre theory.¹³

This charge of massacre is refuted by earlier works on Forrest such as those published by Thomas Jordan and J.P. Pryor, John Allan Wyeth, Andrew Lytle, Robert Selph Henry, Jac Weller, and most recently by Lonnie E. Maness. These authors maintain that Forrest took Fort Pillow because of superior strength and tactics of his forces.¹⁴

A look at some of the events that led to the capture of Fort Pillow should be instructive. Fort Pillow was occupied by Union troops in early June 1862 after it was evacuated following the Confederate defeat at Shiloh. The fort served as a focal point and base of operations for the occupation of that part of West Tennessee. In early 1864 it was garrisoned by Tennessee Unionists troops, the 13th Tennessee Cavalry, commanded by Major

William F. Bradford, who was described by Major General Stephen A. Hurlbut as a "good officer, though not of much experience."¹⁵ By April 3, Major Lionel F. Booth, commanding the First Battalion, Sixth United States Colored Heavy Artillery, had arrived at Fort Pillow along with Company D, Second United States Light Artillery (Colored). There were 292 men in these commands and 285 with Bradford. There were three other men (post staff members) from other white units at Pillow, making a total of 580 men. Being senior in rank, Booth assumed command of the fort as ordered. Booth reported to Hurlbut that there was no sign of enemy activity for thirty or forty miles around the fort. He thought Fort Pillow was "perfectly safe" and had no fear of an attack.¹⁶ How wrong he was!

From his headquarters in Jackson, Tennessee, Forrest responded to the entreaties of local citizens, including citizens in the Fort Pillow area, to do something about "the nest of outlaws" at Fort Pillow who were robbing and pillaging the citizens around Fort Pillow besides "venting upon the wives and daughters of Confederate soldiers the most opprobrious and obscene epithets with more than one extreme outrage upon the persons of these victims of their hate and lust."¹⁷ Forrest and his senior officers decided to move against Fort Pillow. Troops under Brigadier General James R. Chalmers, some 1,500, were ordered to Fort Pillow while other troops menaced Columbus, Kentucky, and captured Paducah, Kentucky, for the second time. Yet other troops were to threaten Memphis, and the rumor was spread that Forrest was moving on Memphis¹⁸ himself. The idea was to confuse the enemy until it was too late to save Fort Pillow at 5:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 12, surprising the Union

pickets with some being killed, some captured, and some escaping to the fort in order to give the alarm. Chalmers's men soon occupied the first line entrenchments.¹⁹

The Union commander tried to burn the barracks in order to prevent their use as cover by the Confederates. Many of the men detached for this duty were killed and wounded, but one row of buildings was burned, no doubt with some of the Union wounded being burned to death. The rest of the barracks were occupied by the Confederates. Forrest, his staff, and Colonel D.M. Wisdom with about 300 men arrived about 10 a.m. Forrest conferred with Chalmers, reconnoitered the fort twice and had two horses shot and killed, one on the first circuit and one on the second. Forrest discovered a ravine that almost encircled the fort. He also realized that from the high ground he could post sharpshooters that could see most of the area inside the fort and make it so hot for the Union boys that he could get his men into the ravine easily. And once there, the opposing forces would be on opposite sides of the same inner earthworks of the fort, and Forrest, with overwhelming numbers, would have the fort at his mercy. This movement was accomplished without difficulty. Once in the ravine, his forces were relatively safe from the fire of the gunboat New Era. Forrest also ordered a section of artillery placed to endanger the gunboat. The fort undoubtedly signalled New Era because it steamed up the river out of danger.²⁰

Forrest knew he could take the fort, and he thought the Union commander would also realize his hopeless position. To prevent the shedding of more blood, Forrest asked for a cease-fire around 3:30 p.m. After this was granted, he sent in

a demand for unconditional surrender. After some delay, Major Bradford, signing the dead Major Booth's name, stated: "I will not surrender."²¹ I might add the fact that the fort never did officially surrender. Bradford refused to surrender because he believed he had a very strong position and that he would be reinforced by steamboats loaded with troops that were close by and by the action of the Union gunboat. Furthermore, he did not wish to be viewed as another Isaac R. Hawkins.²²

By this time Forrest saw three transports approaching the fort. He was quite aware that these ships were not supposed to be approaching while a flag of truce was in effect. Immediately, he sent 200 to 300 men to occupy the old rifle pits at the face of the bluff on the Mississippi River some sixty yards from the south entrance of the fort. Another 200 to 300 men were sent to occupy the rifle pits north of the fort along the river. When these troops were ordered to fire on the transports, they did so. These craft landed no troops; Forrest's men brought enough fire on the New Era to neutralize that ship.²³

Forrest now ordered the fort stormed by about 1,200 men climbing up the earthenworks to gain the top of the embankment. A large number of Forrest's men broke through to the center of the fort where several companies of black troops were stationed. Each of Forrest's men had two six-shot pistols plus a carbine--thirteen shots. Undoubtedly, a large number of Union soldiers were killed and wounded on the spot; more were killed as they escaped from the fort down the bluff to the river. This evacuation south ran into a wall of fire from Major Anderson's detachment; those escaping to the north encountered a wall of

fire from Major Barteau's detachment. Many jumped into the river and were shot trying to escape; many threw down their weapons, but many kept firing, and some who had thrown down their weapons picked them up and resumed firing. Thus, many Union soldiers were killed and wounded at the river bank. Forrest and Chalmers shortly entered the fort. After the Union flag was lowered, Forrest ordered the firing to cease.²⁴

John L. Jordan maintains that 398 Union soldiers survived out of a garrison of 580 men, or, in other words, there was a total of 182 killed, drowned, or missing as a result of this engagement for a total of 31.03 percent of the garrison.²⁵ John A. Wyeth, in figuring total casualties came up with 53.8 percent of the garrison's strength.²⁶ These are staggering figures, but the War Between the States is full of such statistics. In fact, great as the Fort Pillow casualty figures are, they are exceeded by at least fifty Confederate regiments in single engagements during the war and by more than fifty Union regiments,²⁷ but these were not massacres. Likewise, Fort Pillow was a horrible slaughter but not a massacre of unresisting and helpless troops, even though, as in all battles, it is undoubtedly true that a few Union troops, both white and black, did attempt to surrender and were shot in the passion of battle. Given the nature of this battle, it is surprising that the casualty figure was not greater. Casualties no doubt would have been higher had not Forrest hauled down the Union flag and ordered the firing to cease.²⁸

Yes, Forrest did become the Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan in April 1867, an organization that came into existence in late 1865. But contrary to popular belief, Forrest did not

found this organization. He came to the head of this organization at a time of great trouble, both political and economic, in Tennessee and throughout the ex-Confederacy. What I am about to say no doubt could be applied throughout the ex-Confederacy. What I am about to say no doubt could be applied throughout the ex-Confederate States, but I am going to use Tennessee as the test case. Since the Klan was made up of ex-Confederate soldiers, Forrest could have led it against Governor William G. Brownlow, but he did not. His was a moderating influence. Specifically, Forrest came to head the Klan at a time when most white ex-Confederate Tennesseans were denied civil rights in Tennessee. They could not vote or hold public office. The administration of Governor Brownlow began in early 1865 when just over 23,000 unconditional Unionists were permitted to vote. The general assembly was elected by these same voters. The extent of the disenfranchisement can be seen when one realizes that roughly 150,000 Tennesseans voted in the 1860 presidential election. Had there been no denial of voting rights in 1865 there would have been considerably more than 150,000 voters. Thus, a minority dictatorship descended upon Tennessee with the full support of the Radical Republican Congress in Washington, D.C. The majority of Tennesseans were oppressed, and by 1867 this minority government had passed legislation giving adult male blacks the franchise because of the growing split in the ranks of the Unionists. Conservative Unionists were giving the more radical element a difficult time as they too disagreed with the denial of civil rights to the ex-Confederate majority. Thus, Brownlow believed he would need the black vote to win reelection in 1867. 29

The Klan was organized to give protection to the majority of Tennesseans who could not look to the Brownlow government to protect their rights. For example, the Klan was opposed to the laws which imposed fines and imprisonment upon all who might criticize the Brownlow administration or those who made libelous statements against Tennessee or the United States.³⁰ It opposed the effort to limit the carrying of sidearms to those citizens who had served in the Union army or those who were unconditional loyalists.³¹ The legislature tried but failed to enact a law that would prohibit the wearing of the Confederate uniform. Another bill which failed to pass was directed at ministers of the Gospel who had sympathized with the Confederacy. This bill would have prohibited them from performing marriage ceremonies, forced them to work on public roads, pay poll taxes, and serve in the militia. The Senate also considered a bill that would have required women to take an oath of allegiance to the United States before they could be married.³² In general the legislature, at Brownlow's urging, passed or tried to pass punitive laws against the ex-Confederates. In short, there was a deep, widespread feeling of insecurity felt by the majority of Tennesseans because of what the governor said and because of what the legislature did or tried to do. This feeling increased when Governor Brownlow called out the militia to be used against them.³³

But of greatest importance, the Klan was organized to agitate for voting and office holding rights for the oppressed majority. When these rights were secured in 1869 under Governor Dewitt C. Senter, Forrest ordered the Klan disbanded. Forrest, like Brownlow's opponent in the 1867 gubernatorial election,

Henry Emerson Etheridge, agitated for voting and officeholding rights for the majority of Tennesseans. Forrest worked very hard for true majority rule even though this extra-legal organization did violate some laws, not exactly unlike what the Sons of Liberty had done in the 1770s. This group violated various laws passed by the British parliament such as the Stamp Act and the Tea Act. And needless to say, black civil rights organizations engaged in civil disobedience in the South in the 1950s and 1960s in their struggles for voting rights and desegregation. Thus, let me emphasize that the Klan of the 1860s is not the Klan of the 1990s.³⁴

By way of conclusion, let me say once more that Forrest was a kind slave master and dealer in slaves. If he is to be condemned for being a slave trader, then the entire class of slaveowners like Thomas Jefferson, Henry Clay, Andrew Jackson, and others must also be condemned because they too bought and sold slaves as the need arose. I do not think that such condemnation is fair in terms of the value system that existed during the ante-bellum period. As far as Fort Pillow goes, I do not believe that a massacre took place in terms of large numbers of unresisting men being shot down after they surrendered. Finally, Forrest led the Klan to help right a great injustice perpetrated by the Radical Republicans--to regain civil rights for the majority of Tennesseans. When this objective was accomplished, Forrest disbanded the Klan. And I might add that during Forrest's last years he had, for that time in our history, a most enlightened attitude toward the black race. In a speech he delivered in July 1875 Forrest, in speaking to an audience of blacks, stated:

I believe I can exert some influence, and do much to assist the people in strengthening fraternal relations, and shall do all in my power to elevate every man--to depress none. I want to elevate you to take positions in law offices, in stores, on farms, and wherever you are capable of going...I want you to come nearer to us....We have but one flag, one country; let us stand together. We may differ in color, but not in sentiment....35

One may conclude from this and other remarks that Forrest made during the last several years of his life that he had developed a great deal of racial open-mindedness, that he was far in advance of most white Americans--North and South alike. In many ways Forrest was a great American. He was a man of honor; he was an untutored military genius; he was a humanitarian slaveowner and slave trader, and from about 1869 forward he developed a very enlightened view on race relations. Forrest deserves more respect than some people give him.

The University of Tennessee at Martin

SOURCES

1Hurst, Jack. Nathan Bedford Forrest: A Biography (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), pp. 26-29, Chapter 4; Robert Selph Henry, First With the Most Forrest. (Wilmington, North Carolina reprint: Broadfoot Publishing Company, 1987), p. 26.

2Hurst. Nathan Bedford Forrest: A Biography, pp. 38-42; Brian Steel Wills, A Battle from the Start: The Life of Nathan Bedford Forrest (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992), pp. 3-35; Henry, First With the Most Forrest), p. 26.

3 Ibid, pp. 14, 15, 23, Chapter 2; Andrew N. Lytle, Bedford Forrest and His Critter Company, reprint of 1931 edition (Nashville, Tennessee: J.S. Sanders and Company, 1992), p. 28; Lucy Leffinwell Bilke, George W. Cable: His Life and Letters. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), p. 20.

4Henry. First With the Most Forrest, pp. 441, 442.

5 Ibid, Lytle. Bedford Forrest and His Critter Company;

Thomas Jordan and J.P. Pryor, The Campaigns of Lieut.-Gen. N. B. Forrest and of Forrest's Cavalry (Dayton, Ohio: Press of Morningside Bookshop, 1973); Lonnie E. Maness, An Untutored Genius: The Military Career of General Nathan Bedford Forrest. (Oxford, Mississippi: The Guild Bindery Press, 1990).

6Maness, An Untutored Genius: The Military Career of General Nathan Bedford Forrest, pp. 1216-1233.

7 Ibid, pp. 224-227, 245.

8 Ibid, p. 245.

9 Ibid, p. 239.

10U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre, House Report No. 65, 38th Congress, 1st Session, pp. 1-128.

11Castel, Albert. "The Fort Pillow Massacre: A Fresh Examination of the Evidence," Civil War History 4 (March 1958), pp. 37-50.

12Cimprich, John and Robert C. Mainfort, Jr., eds. "Fort Pillow Revisited: New Evidence About an Old Controversy," Civil War History, 4 (Winter 1982), pp. 293-306.

13Willis, A Battle from the Start, pp. 192-193; Hurst, Nathan Bedford Forrest, pp. 171-177.

14Jordan and Pryor, The Campaigns of Lieut.-Gen. N. B. Forrest and of Forrest's Cavalry; John Allan Wyeth, Life of General Nathan Bedford Forrest (Dayton, Ohio: Press of Morningside Bookshop, 1975); Lytle, Bedford Forrest and His Critter Company; Henry, First With the Most Forrest; Jac Weller, "Nathan Bedford Forrest: An Analysis of Untutored Military Genius," Tennessee Historical Quarterly, 18 (September 1959): pp. 213-215; Maness, An Untutored Genius: The Military Career of General Nathan Bedford Forrest.

15The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. 128 vols. (Washington, D.C.: pp. 1880-1901), Series 1, Part 1, 32:566 (Hereinafter referred to as the Official Records).

16 Ibid, Dinkins, "The Capture of Fort Pillow," p. 460.

17Jordan and Pryor, The Campaigns of Lieut.-Gen. N. B. Forrest and of Forrest's Cavalry, pp. 1422-1423; James Dinkins, "The Capture of Fort Pillow," Confederate Veteran, 33 (December 1925), p. 460. Dinkins served with Forrest at Fort Pillow as aid-de-camp on General Chalmers' staff. Charles W. Anderson, "The True Story of Fort Pillow," Confederate Veteran, 3 (November 1895, p. 323.

18 Ibid, Dinkins, "The Capture of Fort Pillow," p. 460.

19Jordan, John L. "Was There a Massacre at Fort Pillow?" Tennessee Historical Quarterly, 6 (June 1947), pp. 111-113; Castel, "The Fort Pillow Massacre," pp. 37-50.

20Anderson, "The True Story of Fort Pillow," p. 322; Dinkins, "The Capture of Fort Pillow," pp. 460-461.

21 Ibid, Anderson, "The True Story of Fort Pillow," p. 322; John A. Wyeth, "The Storming of Fort Pillow," Harper's Magazine, 99 (September 1899), pp. 596-598; John Cimprich and Robert C. Mainfort, Jr., "Dr. Fitch's Report on the Fort Pillow/Massacre," Tennessee Historical Quarterly, 44 (Spring 1985), pp. 27, 28. Captain Theodorick Bradford was detailed as the signal officer at Fort Pillow. He undoubtedly signalled the New Era of its danger.

22 Official Records, Series I, Part I, 32:560, 561. These documents were furnished by Lieutenant Mack J. Leaming, Adjutant, 13th Tennessee Cavalry on the capture of Fort Pillow.

23 Ibid, Series I, Part I, 32:614, 615; Henry, First With the Most Forrest, pp. 253, 254; Lytle, Bedford Forrest and His Critter Company, p. 278; Cimprich and Mainfort, "Dr. Fitch's Report on the Fort Pillow Massacre," pp. 31, 38; House Report No. 65, p. 86; Dinkins, "The Capture of Fort Pillow," p. 461; Anderson, "The True Story of Fort Pillow," p. 323; Wyeth, "The Storming of Fort Pillow," p. 598.

24 Official Records, Series I, Part I, 32:614, 615, 554, 570; House Report No. 65, pp. 23, 39, 44, 86; Anderson, "The True Story of Fort Pillow," pp. 423-425; Dinkins, "The Capture of Fort Pillow," pp. 451, 460, 461; Wyeth, "The Storming of Fort Pillow," pp. 598-603; Cimprich and Mainfort, "Fort Pillow Revisited," p. 299, 301.

25Jordan, "Was There A Massacre at Fort Pillow?" pp. 111-114.

26Wyeth, Life of General Nathan Bedford Forrest, pp. 358-361; Wyeth, "The Storming of Fort Pillow," p. 600.

27McWhiney, Grady and Perry D. Jamieson. Attack and Die: Civil War Military Tactics and the Southern Heritage (University, Alabama, 1982); Jordan, "Was There A Massacre at Fort Pillow?" p. 114.

28Wyeth, "The Storming of Fort Pillow," pp. 598-603; Anderson, "The True Story of Fort Pillow," pp. 323-325.

29Corlew, Robert E. Tennessee: A Short History (Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee Press, 1981), pp. 322-323, 328-331; Robert H. White, ed., Messages of the Governors of Tennessee, 8 Vols. (Nashville, Tennessee: The Tennessee Historical Commission, 1952-1972), 5:400; Philip M. Hamer, Tennessee: A History 1673-1932, 4 Vols. (New York: The American Historical Society, Inc., 1933), 2:595, 596. The "Damnesty Oath," prescribed by Military Governor Andrew Johnson, required that each voter swear that he would "cordially oppose

all armistices or negotiations for peace with rebels in arms." The 1865 vote met Lincoln's Ten Percent Plan, but it nevertheless represented government by a small minority of Tennesseans. This can be easily seen by looking at the total vote for John Bell, John C. Breckinridge, and Stephen A. Douglas in the 1860 Presidential election. They received 146,147 votes. Also look at the number of Tennesseans who voted on the secession of Tennessee in June 1861. If every adult white male had been allowed to vote in 1865, the totals would have been even greater. Minority rule did not disturb Brownlow and the Radicals. He recalled that such men as Noah, Lot and Jesus Christ had been in the minority as E. Merton Coulter has pointed out in William G. Brownlow: Fighting Parson of the Southern Highlands (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1937), pp. 281, 282. The Knoxville Whig, Brownlow's newspaper stated: "He reflects that, at this time, minorities are occupying the places in a bivouacking (sic) on the plains of glory, while majorities are crowding the deep caverns and pitching their tents on the hill tops of hell." (quoted in Coulter, William G. Brownlow, p. 282). While Brownlow was governor, his son, John B. Brownlow, managed his newspaper. The governor, however, did not stop writing articles for the Whig. (quoted in ibid., p. 263). See also Edward McPherson, During the Period of Reconstruction (Washington, 1880), p. 27.

30Coulter, William G. Brownlow: Fighting Parson of the Southern Highlands, pp. 268, 269.

31 Ibid., p. 270.

32Fertig, James Walter. The Secession and Reconstruction of Tennessee (Chicago, 1898), pp. 66, 67; Hilary A. Herbert, ed., Why the Solid South (Baltimore, Maryland, 1890), p. 180.

33Wyeth, John A. Life of General Nathan Bedford Forrest (Dayton, Ohio: Morningside Bookshop, 1988), p. 619, 620.

34Henry, First With the Most Forrest, Chapter 27.

35The Commercial Appeal, July 6, 1875, p. 1; Lonnie E. Maness, "Henry Emerson Etheridge and the Gubernatorial Election of 1867: A Study in Futility"; The West Tennessee Historical Society Papers, Vol. 47 (December 1993): pp. 37-49.

